

REMARKS

In the outstanding official action, independent claim¹ and claim 11 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hieda et al, with the remaining claims (other than claim 12) being rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hieda in view of the cited and applied secondary references, all for the reasons of record. No specific rejection of claim 12 appears to be present in the action, and it is accordingly respectfully requested that if the instant amendment does not place this application in condition for allowance, that the next action be made non-final to avoid prejudice.

In response to the foregoing rejections, independent claim 1 is herewith amended in order to more particularly and precisely recite the novel and unobvious features of the instant invention, and it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as herewith amended, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are now clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references for the reasons detailed below.

In the Action, it is suggested that Hieda teaches a method of producing a stamp (61-68) by attaching particles (66) to a surface of an auxiliary body (61-62) and using the stamp (61-68) to imprint an impritable material.

A detailed examination of the cited and applied figures will reveal that particles 66 are in fact attached to a surface 62 (see

Fig. 6B), but that, as described in the reference, these particles are used only as a mask and are in fact removed, thus no longer being present in the subsequent structure as shown in cited Fig. 6C. Accordingly, the particles themselves, having been removed, are clearly incapable of serving to imprint an impritable material.

In independent claim 1 as herewith amended, on the contrary, it is now more particularly and precisely recited that particles 14 are attached to a surface 15 of an auxiliary body 16 in a pattern on a stamp 13, and that the attached particles on the stamp are then used to imprint an inprintable material, with each body 10 having at least a surface portion bearing a direct imprint 11 of the particle pattern in the stamp 13. All of the foregoing is clearly depicted in Fig. 1 and the associated description thereof in the instant specification.

Thus, in the instant invention as now more clearly and precisely recited, the attached particles are used to make a direct imprint of the particle pattern in the stamp. This subject matter, as now more precisely recited, is clearly patentably distinguishable over Hieda where the cited particles 66 are merely used as a mask, and are then removed during the manufacturing process, and are thus unable to make a direct imprint, since they are no longer present.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, and the remaining

claims depending therefrom, are now in condition for allowance.

Favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Steven R. Biren, Reg. No. 26,531

Attorney

(914) 333-9630